

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,559,860 (Mizikovsky) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0207560 (Speight).

Claims 1-10 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizikovsky in view of Speight. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of Mizikovsky in Applicant's previously-filed response and reasserts all arguments submitted in that response. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

Speight discloses an information assistance service, which enables a user to generate a personal dialing queue containing multiple listings, and to call multiple parties listed in the personal dialing queue without the need to make additional requests for information assistance. A request is received from a user for multiple listings representing parties that the user wishes to contact. In response, the operator conducts a search and generates a personal dialing queue that includes a list of telephone numbers, each associated with a respective party. A first telephone number is selected from the personal dialing queue, and a connection is established between the user and the first telephone number. Call status signals associated with the connection are monitored. When the called party disconnects, and the user remains on the line for a predetermined period of time, a second connection is made for the user to a second telephone number selected from the personal dialing queue. This process may repeat until the list of telephone numbers in the personal dialing queue is exhausted.

Regarding claims 1, 5, 6 and 10, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest automatically

answering the call when the calling party's phone number is flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party. The Examiner admits that Mizikovsky does not disclose or suggest these limitations but asserts that Speight discloses these limitations at col. 40. However, these portions merely disclose that the results of a search, based on a request from a user, are stored in a personal dialing queue where in queue may include columns listing a list of vendor names, a telephone number associated with each respective vendor name and a binary flag indicating whether a successful call (i.e., a call that was answered) has been made to the corresponding telephone number (binary flag="1") or not (binary flag="0"). Calls are made to numbers in the queue sequentially if the user stays on the line after a previous call has ended. This is not automatically answering the call when the calling party's phone number is flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself creating a full-duplex connection with the calling party, as recited in the claims of the present application. Speight teaches away from the limitations in the claims of the present application in that Speight relates dialing a call. This is not answering a call. Further, Speight discloses a flag indicating whether a successful call has been made to a number in the queue. This is not a calling party's phone number being flagged as a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself, as recited in the claims of the present application. The flag in Speight relates to the called party, not the calling party. Moreover, the flag in Speight has nothing to do with a phone number capable of causing the mobile phone to answer itself.

Regarding claims 2-4 and 7-9, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 6 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-10 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-10 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about the present amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

Debra K. Stephens

(Applicant)

By: 

Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199

Date: July 14, 2008